



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,820	10/08/2008	Lyian He	60224US	7416
23430	7590	07/08/2011	EXAMINER	
GEORGE A LEONE, SR			SISSON, BRADLEY L	
CITADEL PATENT LAW			ART UNIT	
9124 Gravelly Lake Drive SW			PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 102			1634	
Lakewood, WA 98499				
		NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		07/08/2011		ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

george.leone@citadelpatentlaw.com
marissa.leone@citadelpatentlaw.com

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/582,820	HE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Bradley L. Sisson	1634

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) <u>Bradley L. Sisson, Primary Examiner.</u>	(3) <u>Wayne Frasch.</u>
(2) <u>George A. Leone, Reg. No. 30,567.</u>	(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 June 2011.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Draft amendment to claims 1-3, with new claims 8-14 (copy attached).

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Bradley L. Sisson/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634		
--	--	--

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,

(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Claims 1 and 10, steps (d)-(f) were discussed with attention focusing on the expression "the series of molecular motors" as found in step (e). Examiner Sisson indicated that it was not clear if "the series of molecular motors" was that complexed in step (d) or whether it was a different portion of "the series of molecular motors" was used to form the complex in (d). Messrs. Frasch and Leone indicated that they will consider alternative language whereby step (d) would be moved to be between steps (e) and (f).

Agreement was reached that in step (e), line 2, the term "nucleotide" would be replaced with >>nucleic acid<<.

Agreement was reached that in claim 1, step (h), lines 2-3, the expression "as indicated by monitoring" would be replaced with >>by detecting<<. Messrs. Leone and Frasch also agreed that claim 10 would be similarly amended; and that dependent claims 8 and 9 would be amended so to reflect such changes in claim 1 from which they depend.

Agreement was reached that claim 1, step (h), lines 5 and 8, the expression "unique corresponding" would be replaced with >>specific<<.

Claim 10, step (h) was discussed. The aspect of substituting "where the at least one wavelength indicates" with >>wherein detection of at least one wavelength of light is indicative<< was discussed.

Examiner Sisson expressed concern that the expression "quencher metal nanorod detection probe" (new claim 12) may raise an issue of new matter. Examiner Sisson noted that the specification references the metal nanorods as scattering light, not emitting or quenching light.

Examiner Sisson indicated that the claims as presently written fairly encompass using "metal nanorods" where the "metal" can be virtually any metal, and not just noble metals, or gold, as exemplified in the disclosure. Examiner Sisson indicated that a review of art that was published before the priority date of 17 December 2003, failed to produce art showing that metal nanorods, exhibiting the requisite characteristics, could be readily produced from any metal, much less that they were commercially available. Applicant indicated that he would be submitting publications showing that the state of the art prior to the priority date.

Examiner Sisson noted that proposed new claims 13 and 14 recite a plethora of alternative detection means, yet the specification has not been found to set forth the essential reaction conditions and starting materials. The decision in Genentech v. Novo Nordisk A/S (Fed. Cir. 1997) 42 USPQ2d 1001 was cited. Messrs. Leone and Frasch indicated that they will consider submitting evidence showing the state of the art at the time of filing as it relates to each of the specified methods of detection and how one of skill in the art at the time of the invention could practice the full scope of the claims without having resort to undue experimentation.